A. Interpretation: The aff must specify a type (a state, a type of violent felony)

B. Violation: Aff didn’t spec.

C. Standards:

1) Ground: If they don’t specify a scenario, then there is no stable advocacy that I can link my disads to. When the aff says that they defend the resolution merely as a general principle, I can’t possibly know exactly what that entails. Thus I cannot link disads as harms to their advocacy because of its prevailing ambiguity. Ground is key to fairness since it’s the basis for argumentation.

2) Strat skew: The vagueness of their plan allows them to shift out of arguments since they aren’t tied down to a specific advocacy. This is terrible for the neg since I now have no specific advocacy to hold them to, allowing them to shift in the 1AR, so have no way to form a sound substantive strat for this speech. Strat skew key to fairness because I need to formulate a coherent strat to have any chance of winning.

3) Predictability: In the real world policy makers must be accountable for differences in policy options, i.e. dealing with convenience store burglars and serial rapists, which obviously should be different. Their lack of specification ignores this distinction in the real world, making their advocacy unpredictable. Predictability is key to fairness since I need to be able to prepare for arguments to have a fair chance of winning.

D. Fairness is a voter because debate is a competitive activity designed to determine the better debater; adjudicating unfair debates only determines who was arbitrarily advantaged, not who gave the better performance.